

Tsarkov, Alex

From: Rob [rcfulton@optonline.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 9:50 AM
To: Tsarkov, Alex
Cc: ctcondowners@yahoo.com
Subject: Written Testimony is Support of HB6620 Condo Bills; For Public Hearing 3/25/11
 For Judiciary Committee Public Hearing March 25, 2011

IN FAVOR OF HB6620, HB 1205 and HB1208 Condo Bills

All buildings in the complex require flood insurance; we use to have the entire bill divided amongst all unit owners based on their percentage of ownership, much like most budgeted items. Then when ½ the buildings were in one flood zone and the others were placed in another flood zone the amounts varied from \$3000 for half of the 10 buildings and \$6000 for the other half of the 10 buildings. It has since increased. Yet the logic based on the flood threat was not realistic. I took extensive video of the March 2011 flooding which reached 15-16 ft according to the Farmington River Flood gauges. This flood was 2 feet above moderate flooding, 4 ft below major flooding and none of the buildings had water. It would have to have come up another 10-20 more feet to affect us. No different than previous years when flooding occurred. The reason it changed is because the BOD felt it was better to special assess the flood insurance based on the building instead of dividing it equally though out the Association because of the different zones and hence different premium costs. Of course at the time of change 8 out of 9 BOD lived in the buildings with the least expensive premiums. Now flood insurance is around \$62,000 for all buildings which is the second highest, I think, after oil. Half the buildings on the same property pay approx \$41,000 in premiums while the other half pay approx \$21,000 in premiums. Yet we all share the property and continue to remain high and dry.

My argument was if they can bill each unit/building separately then we know each building uses various amount of oil for heat and hot water and why couldn't this be billed separate? That is when I got the \$15-\$20K answer which could have stemmed from when the flood insurance billing was changed most recently. My reasoning is that many owners including myself found it ridiculous that we needed to pay a past budgeted item as a special assessment yet we have no control over who we can use for and Insurance agent, as well as knowing that the zones seemed to be not in conjunction with reality of actual past flooding events. I'd rather see things billed equally in the association based on factual equal ownership of the entire association.

Sorry but I'm a little frustrated as well. We have also been waiting 8 months for the Management Company, BOD and insurance agent to complete paperwork for a FEMA LOMA. I think Condo life could be beneficial to the environment and people based on a smaller carbon foot print and having a better purchasing power as well as fair, balanced and realistic assessments. Yet after 6 years of Condo life I and many owners have become very discouraged and I'm looking to move, despite loving the school, location and people in general.

I know in order to right wrongs and call attention to issues sometimes legal action needs to be taken, but I also realize that if legal action was taken we in the association all

3/24/2011

would have to pay the price. Most battles are based on maintenance issues involving money due to lack of management training or sometimes favoritism or maybe are just perceived as so. When the Flood insurance was changed and billed as a separate special assessment the Associations attorney was there so there might have been fees to change the billing it in the first place. I mean no offense to the legal profession, but sometimes the attorney fees far exceed the issues at hand, especially when interpretations of the laws are at hand.

Hopefully someday a CCOC will get enough support to create an Ombudsmen office where a neutral third party could step in without costing Associations and owners an arm and a leg and placing owners in financial hardships.

Respectfully emailed
Robert Fulton